REMARKS

Claims 8-14 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-6 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 7-14 have been added.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority. However, in the Office Action dated March 18, 2005, there was a typographical error, indicating that the priority document had been received by the Patent Office. No priority document has been submitted in this case prior to today's filing.

Submitted herewith is a certified copy of the corresponding Japanese patent application (JP 2001-091635, filed March 28, 2001). An indication that this document has been safely received would be appreciated.

Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

A Substitute Specification is attached to this Amendment in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.125, with markings showing all changes relative to the original specification. Additionally, a clean version of the Specification is also attached to this Amendment. Missing drawing item numbers 210, 211, 250, 251 have been added (paragraphs 22 and 28), and the text has been edited to improve readability and correct grammatical errors. It is asserted that the substitute specification includes no new matter. Furthermore, the Abstract has been amended to conform to US requirements.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Burton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,128). Claims 1-6 have been canceled and new claims 7-14 have been added to more fully claim the invention. Accordingly, the rejections under Burton et al. are traversed relative to the new claims as follows.

Burton et al. disclose a technique in which a host computer receives path information designating a preferred controller and non-preferred controller for executing an operation for some storage area from the controller (see, e.g., Abstract). The encoded path information is returned to a requesting computer. The technique disclosed by Burton et al. means that a host computer sends an input/output command for each storage area by receiving path information for each storage area. Accordingly, Burton et al. teach allocating paths among controllers for balancing the load, and Burton et al. do address coupling a computer with particular logical units, as in the present invention.

The present invention as set forth in new claim 7, enables a computer to couple to a first logical unit based on information to specify each of the logical units, and the computer is not able to couple to second logical units. Thus, the present invention provides a system which executes an operation enabling or not enabling coupling of a logical unit by a computer according to information specifying the logical unit.

By the above-described operation, the computer is able to read and write to the logical unit handled by the computer, and the computer is not able to read and write to the logical units handled by other computers. As a result, security is improved for avoiding data destruction caused by accessing a logical unit not handled by the computer and handled other computers. (See, e.g., paragraphs 4 and 27 in the specification.)

Burton et al. provide no teaching of an application that enables a computer to couple to one or more first logical units based on information to specify each of the logical units, and where the computer is not able to be coupled to one or more second logical units. Rather, Burton et al. are concerned with a path control technique for balancing input and output commands from a computer. The content of the technique of the present invention, relating to execution for logical units, is quite different from the content of the cited reference relating to preferred and non-preferred paths assigned by controllers. Thus, claim 7 is neither anticipated nor suggested by the cited reference to Burton et al.

As for new independent claims 8-14, for the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 7, it is clear that the invention of claims 8-14 has novelty and nonobviousness. In particular new independent claims 12 and 14 both specify that the application enables a computer to operate coupling with the one or more first logical units based on information to specify each of said plural logical units, and the computer is not able to operate coupling with the one or more second logical units. Such a system is neither taught nor suggested by Burton et al.

Additionally, the invention under claim 9 is different from the disclosed by Burton et al., since Burton et al disclose that a controller receives an I/O command from a host computer and directs the I/O command to a target storage area. The present invention of claim 9 includes a command device that receives exclusively an operation command as one of the logical units among the plural logical units. A storage system including such command device is not disclosed nor suggested in the cited reference to Burton et al. The invention of claim 9 means that a command device, which is one of the plural logical units reading and writing from the host computer, receives operation commands from the host computer. By the configuration set forth in claim 9, it becomes possible to receive operation commands and I/O commands by the same device. Therefore, the above-described advantageous effect can not be obtained by the cited reference to Burton et al., whether taken singly, or in combination with the other references of record in the application.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: July 18, 2005